

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Official Action mailed **June 26, 2009** (the “Office Action” or “Action”). Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Status:

Claims 1-11, 14 and 19-24 have been cancelled previously without prejudice or disclaimer. By the forgoing amendment, claims 27-37 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No other amendments are proposed by the present paper. Thus, claims 12, 13, 15-18, 25 and 26 are currently pending for further action.

Allowed Claims:

In the recent Office Action, claims 12, 13, 15-18, 25 and 26 were allowed. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the allowance of these claims.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability, without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning. The current Office Action does not contain a statement of reasons for the allowance of claims 12, 13, 15-18, 25 and 26. In any event, Applicant believes that the application is allowable because the prior art fails to teach, anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of how the claims or claimed subject matter may be paraphrased.

Because all claims other than those expressly allowed by the Examiner have been cancelled by the present amendment, following entry of the present amendment, this application should be in clear condition for allowance.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b):

Claims 27-32 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,981,097 to Rajendran (hereinafter Rajendran). This rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation herein of the affected claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

Claims 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajendran in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,007,932 to Steyn (hereinafter Steyn, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,197,145 to Todd et al. (hereinafter Todd). Again, this rejection is rendered moot by the cancellation herein of the affected claims.

37 C.F.R. § 1.116:

Entry and consideration of this amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The present amendment makes only those changes necessary to place the application in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner. The amendment does not raise issues requiring further search or consideration. And, based on the indications of the Examiner, the present amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of the present amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and is hereby requested.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further

arguments in future papers supporting the patentability of any of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: August 10, 2009

/Steven L. Nichols/  
Steven L. Nichols  
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.  
Managing Partner, Utah Office  
**Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC**  
River Park Corporate Center One  
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150  
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066  
(801) 572-7666 (fax)